More on Dodd and Guatemala, See P. 3

Documentary: Senator Clark's Speech Blueprinting the Way to Attain a World Without War, Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 28 JULY 24, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Nightmare Both K's Must Fear

July 19 Noon

It was a pleasure to see the President bounce into press conference today looking well and chipper again. His most reassuring answer on the Berlin crisis was not put into words at all, but it was eloquent nonetheless. "Mr. President," he was asked, "in your reply to the Soviet aide-memoire, you stressed several times the lack of the right of self-determination among the peoples of Eastern Europe and within the week you have issued a proclamation looking to the freedom of captive nations. Can you conceive," his questioner continued, "in the event of any popular uprisings in Eastern Europe of a more active role for the United States in support of those uprisings than was the case in Hungary in 1956?" Mr. Kennedy's verbal reply was only to say, "I think I will stand on the statement which we made at this time." But the real answer could be seen in the vigorous negative shake of the President's head as he caught the drift of the question.

Not A Sane Way to Run A World

The question touched a fearful point. It is apparent that Mr. Kennedy, always cautious, not disposed to adventurism, is playing it cool on Berlin. Given the nature of the nation-state system, he and Mr. Khrushchov are engaged in an unfortunate but recognizable variant of primitive combat, in which each must scare the other (and his own followers) to make a compromise settlement negotiable and palatable. Neither intends war; that flood of war scare and mobilization stories out of Washington do not derive from the White House but from the Pentagon where there is a lot of overheated talk about *this* being *it*. But the nightmare that must haunt both as they begin to circle each other, growling, is what happens if some unexpected event upsets the fierce pantomime which is supposed to end at the conference table. A new uprising in East Germany would make it very difficult for either Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Khrushchov not to be swept into a war both wish to avoid. The Russians just conceivably might give up East Germany at the conference table in return for recognition of the Oder-Neisse line and a demilitarized Reich. But to let East Germany slip via an uprising would threaten Communist rule in Hungary and Poland; the year 1956 like the year 1848 shows how quickly revolt spreads. It is the possibility of some such flareup in the Reich or elsewhere on this unstable planet which makes it hard to share the complacency with which some observers see these Russo-American preliminaries as mere harmless sparrings. It's an appalling way to run a world when basic problems between nations can only be settled by cocking atomic pistols and seeing whose eyes waver first.

So the vigorous shake of the President's head was comforting, as was his remark toward the end of the press conference about our having "the patience and the willingness to take some setback without taking unwise actions." Mr. Kennedy shows no disposition to be panicked himself, or to panic the country, as was evident when he said (in reply to a question about his speech to the country next Tuesday), "we have to look forward to many challenges in the coming months and years. So we will try to discuss the general problem that the United States faces in the security field in the summer of 1961, and not merely tied to Berlin, but generally." This is not a bugle call for Armaggedon. The pattern visible in the brillian polemic on Berlin read today by the President, as in the more sedate aide mémoire released yesterday, is to use words strong enough to satisfy the troglodytes and Neanderthals in Congress and the Pentagon while opening the door to negotiations. I myself think that if the Russians do not overplay their hand, an agreement is possible which would give added recognition to and greater stability to the East German regime in return for firmer guarantees of access to West Berlin. This is what the Adenauer crowd fears, and explains why his Defense Minister, Strauss, at his press conference here July 14, declared frankly that Russia was not aiming at the "immediate" take-over of Berlin. "What they want," Strauss said, "is diplomatic recognition of East Germany by forcing the

(Continued on Page Four)

Good News on Nuclear Testing

As we go to press, the new issue of Aviation Week (July 17) brings news that joint investigation by two private companies, Raytheon and Allied Research Associates, Inc., show that underground radio waves can be used to detect clandestine nuclear blasts "which would be difficult to spot by present seismic methods or to distinguish from natural phenomena such as earthquakes." They found that "decoupling" (muffling the blast in large holes) does not reduce the radio waves. Aviation Week says "this could open the way to an international inspection system which would be mutually satisfactory both to the U.S. and the Soviet Union." A network of 3,000 small unattended stations in key areas of the globe would make policing possible with no need for on-site inspections until and unless an alarm were given by one of these radio sentinels.

It is interesting that this discovery should come from private concerns. Research for improved detection methods has been in the hands of government agencies hostile to a test agreement. The possibility of a technological break-through underscores the President's wise caution in again postponing resumption of testing (at least until the end of the year, according to White House sources) while we ask the UN to consider the problem.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Penna's Senator Clark Offers A Hopeful Blueprint for A World Without War . . .

Though almost totally ignored by the press, the speech given by Senator Clark (D. Pa.) to the Senate on July 10 offers the one hopeful way out of the growing world crisis. We think it deserves the widest possible circulation and discussion, and we present the gist of it here:

"My purpose this afternoon is to present for discussion a policy for peace and disarmament which I hope will be seriously considered by the President of the United States. . . . Time is short. By fall there may be no time left. There is obviously a struggle going on right now within the executive branch of our Government for the mind of one man—the President of the United States. On the result of that struggle may depend whether we and our children live out our normal life span. . . .

"The President stressed the central issue in his letter submitting the bill to create the proposed Disarmament Agency to the Congress:

" 'Peace cannot be brought about by concentrating solely on measures to control and eliminate weapons. . . . A disarmament program . . . should drive toward the creation of a peaceful world society in which disarmament, except for the forces needed to apply international sanctions, is the accepted condition of international life.' . . .

Not a Form of Gamesmanship

"It is important to understand that the aim of this new agency is . . . total and permanent disarmament enforced through world law. This is no effort to pursue gamesmanship in weapons systems or mere 'arms control.' . . .

"Fortunately there are individuals holding high office who are urging the President to espouse a bold U.S. plan providing for total and permanent disarmament . . . under a system of world law. But unfortunately elsewhere in the government there are officials who object to any change whatever in the status quo—a view successfully urged upon the previous Secretaries of State and President, ever since Mr. Stassen's first efforts for a meaningful disarmament agreement were torpedoed at the London Conference in 1954.

"Any specific steps to implement the disarmament policy set forth now in the pending Disarmament Agency bill are viewed, as one might expect, with suspicion and distaste in certain circles at the Pentagon, the AEC and the Budget Bureau [This is the first hint that the Budget Bureau, too, is hostile to disarmament—IFS]. Until the U.S. disarmament plan is announced, we will not know for sure whether those who put their faith in arms alone or those who favor a bold U.S. initiative for peace have prevailed.

"Speaking for myself, and as one Senator only, I hope the President will endorse a U.S. plan for disarmament, peace and world security . . . the result of many years of painstaking study by two highly qualified experts, Grenville Clark and Prof. Louis B. Sohn. . . . Here are its major outlines:

"*First.* The complete disarmament of all nations—rather than the mere 'reduction' or 'limitation' of armaments. . . . In the nuclear age no mere reduction in new means of mass destruction can be effective. . . .

"*Second.* A permanent world police force, under international authority to forestall or suppress any breach of a disarmament agreement or other violation of world law.

"*Third.* As part of the disarmament treaty, a world law, in constitutional and statutory form. . . .

"*Fourth.* World judicial tribunals. . . .

"*Fifth.* Extensive revision of the Charter of the United Nations . . . to include:

(a) practically universal membership. . . .

(b) A revision of voting procedures to assure that the larger and more powerful nations have an equitable voice and vote in the general legislative assembly, which should be unicameral . . . and in which there should be no veto.

(c) Appropriate executives elected by their reorganized legislative assembly, holding much the same relationship to the assembly as the British Cabinet does to the House of Commons.

(d) A developmental authority. Since one of the most dangerous areas for future conflict lies in the vast disparity between the economic condition of the underdeveloped na-

No Nuclear Arms For Germans

"I speak most respectfully when I say that I do not propose to let the population of West Berlin determine this issue for the Western powers. It was not so many years ago that there existed in Europe another form of totalitarian government known as Nazi Germany, which killed thousands upon thousands of American boys and boys of other Western powers, and exterminated some 6 million Jews. Here is one Senator who has always taken the position, I may say to the brass in the Pentagon, that it is not safe for the peace of the world to give nuclear weapons to the West Germans."

—Morse (D. Ore.) in the Senate July 10

Why Should New Drugs Be Tried Out First on Patients Just to Save the Cost of Tests?

"It is shocking that experimental drugs are subject to no FDA [Food and Drug Adm.] regulation of any sort before patients receive them. Some drug houses perform extensive animal tests before a drug is first put into man; others perform almost none. It is reprehensible for man to be the first experimental animal on which toxicity tests are run, simply because bypassing toxicity tests in laboratory animals saves time and money. . . .

"Does support of these proposed changes [the Kefauver-Celler bill S 1552—the Drug Industry Anti-Trust Act—would give the FDA authority to test new drugs for efficacy as well as safety] indicate a surrender to the government of the doctor's right to 'individualize' therapy? Not at all. The changes in FDA authority would merely keep worthless drugs off the market and provide better guides to the use of those drugs allowed on the market. What of the allegations that only by extensive clinical experience can the true efficacy of a drug be established? The history of medicine is unhappily replete with examples of useless drugs employed for years, decades, or centuries by countless physicians before a few properly conducted experiments proved the drugs to be without value. . . .

"Nor am I taken with the notion that many drugs thought to be useless might turn out to have some worthwhile application if given to enough patients. This notion, carried to its logical conclusion, would suggest that all the chemicals in the world should be on the market since one of them may be the cure for cancer."

—Dr. Louis Lasagna, head of Clinical Pharmacology, Johns Hopkins, testifying for S 1552, Kefauver Com. July 19.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Linked to K's Offer to Accept Any Control in A Disarmed World

tions and those of Western Europe, the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and Japan, the world of organization should establish its own development authority administered by an economic and social council.

(e) Its own revenue system. . . .

"This plan is admittedly bold; some will say radical; but so was the Constitution of the United States. This plan calls for a yielding of a limited amount of sovereignty by the nations of the world in order to prevent that annihilation of humanity which a third world war would bring. . . .

"This plan will find little favor with those wedded to the status quo . . . [it] is far in advance of public opinion in this country today. . . . And yet if it were patiently and fully presented by the Chief Executive and the overriding needs for such a plan to reverse the arms race were explained I am confident that the American people would support the President. . . .

Would the Russians Agree?

"It will be said that the Russians will never agree. But let us look at the record—a record which unfortunately has not been made clear to the American people.

"On June 4, 1961, Premier Khrushchov at Vienna handed an aide memoire to President Kennedy in which he said:

" 'The Soviet government, as is well known, has already more than once emphasized that the Soviet government, on its part, is willing unconditionally to accept any Western control proposals if the Western powers accept the proposal for general and complete disarmament. . . . When all states disarm . . . each country will have proper guarantees of its security. . . . In these conditions we are ready to accept any control proposed by the Western powers.' . . .

"I suggest that the least we can do is put Mr. Khrushchov to the test. If he means what he says on disarmament controls and we can get him to recognize a strong international peace-keeping authority in a disarmed world, would we not have found the road to permanent peace? . . . If he does not mean what he says let us at least call his bluff and make our own position abundantly clear to the world. . . .

"There remains the problem—and perhaps insoluble problem—of China. All agree that disarmament without Chinese Communist participation can never be effective. President Eisenhower at his press conference Feb. 11, 1960 [said] . . . 'Well, it's perfectly clear that in such a big territory, such a great population could not be ignored when you are talking about general disarmament. . . .'

Cyrus Eaton Honored

Pugwash, Nova Scotia—Presentation of a citation to Cyrus Eaton for his "devotion and dedication" to the improvement of international understanding marked the conclusion of the Tenth Pugwash Intellectual Life Conference of American University Presidents here July 16. The group, which has been in session here since July 7 under the sponsorship of the Association of American Colleges, includes Presidents of colleges affiliated with the major Protestant denominations as well as the Catholic faith. The college presidents unanimously declared "one of our prime tasks is to work for international understanding, which is among the most urgent goals of American society." In paying tribute to the Cleveland industrialist, the educators stated, "We join in appreciation of the devotion and dedication with which you have contributed to this desirable end."

"That these views are shared by President Kennedy and his principal advisers, I have no doubt. . . .

"It is entirely possible that world-wide efforts for disarmament would break down on the rock of Chinese Communist opposition. Yet how do we know until we try? . . . Is it not possible that if we could come to an agreement with the Russians . . . behind plans for total and permanent disarmament, the dangerously explosive Chinese situation could be brought under control? . . .

"A Senator from Massachusetts, speaking on December 11, 1959 about the expectations raised around the world by the Russian proposal for far-reaching disarmament and the considerable disappointment at the limitations of this proposal, said:

" 'It is for us now to meet these expectations with far-reaching new plans of our own, and not to disappoint the world by treating this problem merely as a matter of psychological warfare. We must design and propose a program that combines disarmament with the strengthening of the United Nations and with world development. . . . So far we have lacked the vision to present a comprehensive program for the development of a world community under law.'

"Those words are as true today as when the President of the United States—then the Senator from Massachusetts—first spoke them. Time is running short. The East-West disarmament conference is imminent. A comprehensive American plan for disarmament under enforceable world law is the present imperative for peace."

A Correction and More Light on Dodd's Work As Foreign Agent for Guatemala

In our issue of July 3 we called attention to a table in the Congressional Record of June 21 (page 10,227) which inadvertently disclosed that Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D. Conn.) was registered as a foreign agent for Guatemala in 1957-58. We were wrong in saying that he was a member of Congress in those years. Mr. Dodd was in the House from 1952 to 1956, but not in 1957-58. The tabulation showed that Mr. Dodd was paid $24,999.96 by the Guatemalan government in 1957 and $41,666.62 in 1958, the year he campaigned successfully for election to the U.S. Senate.

We are in a position to add a few more details to our earlier report. In 1956 Mr. Dodd's last year in the House, when he was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he was able to raise the defense support allocation to the Guatemalan government from the $5,000,000 originally asked by the Eisenhower Administration to $15,000,000. The allocation was first raised in committee to $10,000,000. On June 6, 1956, Mr. Dodd made a speech asking for more funds to make Guatemala (where the CIA had helped overthrow the Arbenz regime two years before) into "a showpiece for its neighbors." On June 7 he moved an amendment adding another $5,000,000 for this purpose to the Mutual Security bill and on June 11, after the bill had passed with his amendment, Mr. Dodd made a statement on the floor "to make perfectly plain the legislative intent" that the extra money was for Guatemala.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adenauer Would Rather Risk Nuclear War Than Give Up Atomic Arms

(Continued from Page One)

West to negotiate with the Ulbricht government for free access to West Berlin." Is this so catastrophic?

The New Drang Nach Osten

Adenauer and Strauss have sold their followers on the belief that nuclear rearmament in alliance with the West can regain for the Reich not only "central Germany" (Mitteldeutschland), as their propagandists call East Germany, but the lands east of the Oder-Neisse at the expense of Poland. That way lies war, and in this is the danger of the West German propaganda emphasis on "self-determination." It is quite true that the Russians do not allow self-determination in their own zone, particularly in East Germany. Indeed everybody likes self-determination best in the other fellow's back-yard; examples: our attitude toward Cuba and Nehru's attitude toward Kashmir. But in Eastern Europe, self-determination for the Germans will be an unpopular slogan even among those who would like self-determination from the Russians. It is only a few years since the Germans applied their own form of self-determination to Eastern Europe which remains fearful, especially when the Germans have begun to arm again, this time with nuclear weapons.

Indeed the principal reason for Strauss's sudden trip here was to emphasize Germany's right to nuclear weapons and to counteract whispers that the Kennedy Administration might be prepared to concede a denuclearized Germany in bargaining with the Russians. Strauss told his press conference at the Pentagon that the decision to introduce tactical nuclear weapons into all NATO forces was made in February, 1957. "We must break nuclear weapons into two categories—means of delivery and warheads," Strauss went on. "The means of delivery weapons must remain part of all allied forces. That means, for West German forces, our air offensive missiles, our air defense missiles and our ground missiles. The problem of nuclear warheads was never raised by the West German government. If Germany is involved in a war it will be a NATO war. If there is a NATO war, nuclear warheads would be released for use of the allied forces. We cannot give up atomic weapons because they are a part of NATO planning for Germany." This emphasis in public seems designed to head off any compromise involving a denuclearized Reich. The Adenauer regime would rather risk a nuclear holocaust than give up nuclear weapons. This is why Adenauer so quickly attacked Willy Brandt's proposals at a press conference in Berlin July 7. The latter suggested that a peace conference could be called to determine the "foreign policy status" (neutral?) of a reunited Reich and that it might consider inclusion of a reunited Germany in an atom free zone. This, to Adenauer and Strauss, would be a loss of Germany's freedom to determine its own destiny. For them, that destiny must be nuclear. These Germans are making trouble again.

How the Satellite Peoples See It

"In a recent article Senor de Madariaga wrote: 'The satellites are as restive as ever, and therefore forbode more trouble than help (for Russia) if it came to a European crisis.' With all respect, I must differ directly with him. Apart from East Germany, the poorest and least successful, the satellites are solidly behind Mr. Khrushchov in his present attitude towards Germany.

"Not to put too fine a point upon it, the Poles, the Czechs, and the Hungarians fear and hate the Germans to an extent which we cannot even begin to comprehend in this country. And the Russians, who suffered less but only relatively, at the hands of the Germans, are not far behind.

"I am referring not to members of the Communist Party, nor to Ministers, but to the people. They are horrified by the prospect of Western Germany getting atomic weapons; and they have no desire to see Germany reunited. This gives to the Soviet Union a massive psychological support throughout Central and Eastern Europe, which we shall underestimate at our peril.

"The reason is understandable when you see and hear of it at first hand. Warsaw and Budapest were destroyed by Hitler's orders. . . . In all four of the countries we visited the Germans killed and killed and killed for five interminable years. The killing was not confined to the Jews; and it is not forgotten."

—Lord Boothby (Ind. C) reporting on a trip through Eastern Europe in the London Sunday Times July 16.

Please Send LONG Stamped Envelopes and Specify The Issues You Want Sent As Samples For Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

7/24/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. All Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED